



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE **MINUTES**

TUESDAY, SEPT. 5, 2006

**LOCATION: CITY CHAMBERS
CARMEL CITY HALL
ONE CIVIC SQUARE
CARMEL, IN 46032**

**TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DOORS OPEN AT 5:30 P.M.**

Those Present:

Representing the Committee:

Dan Dutcher
Kevin Heber
Carol Schleif
Rick Ripma

Representing the Department:

Angie Conn
Christine Barton-Holmes
Mike Hollibaugh

Of Counsel:

John Molitor

Rick Ripma called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00p.m.

The Subdivision Committee will meet to consider the following items:

- 1. Docket No. 06010001 Z: Monon Townes PUD**
The applicant seeks to rezone 6.81 acres from R1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating 65 townhomes.
The site is located at 1001 Rohrer Road.
Filed by Ann M. Walker for Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC.

Present for the Petitioner: Ann Walker-Kloc and Dave Compton with Pulte Homes, Charlie Frankenberger with Nelson and Frankenberger, James White and Steve Schutz with Primrose Development, LLC.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Dave Compton** said that the last time they appeared before the Subdivision Committee was May 2006. He said that they were there at the meeting to ask for some feedback on a new conceptual plan that reflects the comments of the Subdivision Committee members and the comments collected at various neighborhood meetings. He said that Pulte Homes would be stepping away as the developer on this community. He said that Steve Schutz and Jim Wright and Will Wright would be taking on the project. He said that Pulte began the project in 2005. He introduced the project as it was filed originally. He said that they were not asking for a vote, but were just asking if the new builders should continue forward and spend their dollars addressing the Subdivision Committee's concerns in this new plan. He said that the new plan is 38 units versus the 66 units in the plan presented in May. He said that it was a two-story product versus the three-story product in the old plan. He said that the price point would start at \$310,000. He said that they are expected to average \$350,000. He said that the old plan from Pulte averaged \$240,000 house and lot. He said that the existing neighborhood to the South, Autumn Ridge has an average sales price of \$232,000 per the MLS.

Rick Ripma asked if anyone had seen the new plans in very much detail. He said that he was unsure what the petitioners wanted direction on and that he was unsure how to proceed.

Jim White clarified that the effort was to scale back the housing sizes from three-story to two stories because he said that it was understood that building height was a pretty sensitive issue. He said that they are bringing a plan that is not as detailed as what Pulte's last submission was because they wanted to present a conceptual plan to find out if this plan was, generally, going in the right direction. He said that there are details of the plan to be presented and that they knew that they needed to meet with the neighborhood. He said that they didn't want to waste anyone's time.

Rick Ripma said that he wasn't going to open the floor for public comment because he didn't think that anyone truly had anything to comment about. He said that there wasn't enough information yet. He said that it sounded like the petitioner was willing to meet with the neighbors before it came back to the Subdivision Committee. He said that he would hear from the Department.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that the petitioner was requesting that the Committee look at the new plan to let them know whether they were heading in the right direction, so they can prepare more detailed landscaping and engineered drawings for the next meeting.

Dan Dutcher asked when a proposal ceases and a new proposal emerges. He said that they have not really seen enough detail to comment on. He said that from what he has heard, he hasn't heard anything that makes him think that the proposal may not be going in the right direction. He said that he thinks that it is possible that it has evolved so significantly from what the Committee has seen in the past that he thinks that it may need to be treated as a separate, new

proposal.

Angie Conn said that she would discuss the matter with the Counsel.

John Molitor said that there was a rule in the Rules and Procedures for the Plan Commission that says that if a proposal is withdrawn, the petitioner is locked out for six months from submitting the same proposal and the petitioner is locked out for three months from submitting a similar proposal for the same property. He said that there is also a rule that says that the Commission at its discretion may permit amendments or modifications to an existing proposal. He said that in light of that, he feels that the thing to do is to send the petition back to the full Plan Commission with a recommendation that the Commission either allow the petitioner to make the amendments proposed or that the Commission should treat it as a withdraw and that the petitioners should wait to resubmit a new proposal.

Carol Schleif asked if there was anything that talked about the change in petitioner.

John Molitor said that generally land use goes with the land, therefore, the identity of the petitioner could change prior to it being built, etc. He said that when the nature of the proposal and use of the land change is when this comes up.

Rick Ripma said that based upon the little bit of the design that he has seen; it is certainly a huge improvement and addresses a lot of the concerns that were heard originally. He said that he thinks sending it back to the full Plan Commission makes sense to him. He said that he thinks that is fair. He said that they certainly couldn't vote on it tonight.

Charlie Frankenberger, on behalf of the applicant, said that the existing petition was to change the property to a PUD zoning classification. He said that they heard clearly from the neighbors that they needed to reduce building height and density. He said that the petitioners had tried the best that they could to accommodate those concerns. He said that they would ask that, considering that they are responding to the suggestions of the Committee and the Public and adjusting their plans per those suggestions, that they not be treated as a new petition and suffer a three-month penalty or a six-month penalty. He said that they have already done the public notice. He said that this plan is the result of the process doing what it is supposed to be doing. He said that he would ask that the Commission and the Committee just consider this a continuation of the process that was started a while back.

Patrick Rondeau, who resides at 13708 Autumn Lake Overlook, said that they are not against development if it involves high-quality builders. He said that they had worked extensively with Pulte in the past and that they felt like they had made progress in the development plan. He said that in this particular case, he feels that this amendment should be treated as a new filing for a few reasons. He said that they are starting over from scratch from their point of view. He said that he felt that it was Pulte's responsibility to make their business partner aware of whatever discussions and agreements were made beforehand, if this is a continuing petition. He said that if you look at what has been provided with regards to the amendments, the new plan ignores a lot of the things that the neighbors had worked out with Pulte. He gave examples of the items that they felt had been worked out with Pulte that they felt the new plan ignored. He said that they

would expect that the new builder would review and honor many of the prior agreements that were made. He said that is what they would see as being justification for a continuance. He said that they don't even have raw documents to look at beyond two small sheets of paper. He asked how they could tell that it was the same project. He said that, while they argue that they should not be penalized, he would argue the other way. He said that it was the petitioner's responsibility to make sure that the plan was set up correctly when they came here for the fourth time around. He said that in business if you don't do what you are supposed to do, then there should be a penalty. He said that they would like to see a fresh process started with a new petitioner that the neighborhood can work with and who can work with them. He said that way they could come up to the Commission as a unified front in support of the project. He said that those were his comments for now.

Rick Ripma said that he personally didn't see what was to be gained by making the petitioner wait ninety days. He said that it is the same process whether they start over or continue the process.

Dan Dutcher said that he thinks that his conclusions are probably the same, but that the expectations of the Committee are that when it comes back on October 3, 2006, the petitioners will have sat down with the neighbors, fully-developed the plan, and that the Committee members will have received the documents with plenty of time to fully review the plans. So, that the next meeting can be one with the opportunity for full dialogue. He said that with that expectation, he agrees with Rick Ripma.

Carol Schleif added that she would suggest that the starting point be no less than what has already been negotiated. She said that it still wasn't enough and that the petitioners should keep that in mind.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to send docket number **06010001 Z: Monon Townes PUD** back to the full Plan Commission with the **recommendation that the full Plan Commission pass a motion allowing the petitioner to make amendments to the proposal and send it back to the Committee for further deliberation at the October 3, 2006 meeting of the Plan Commission Subdivision Committee.**

Carol Schleif seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously **APPROVED (4-0).**

...END...

2. Docket No. 06040017 PUD: Townhomes at Central Park

The applicant seeks to create 110 townhomes on 8.8 acres.

The site is located at 11400 Westfield Blvd. and is zoned R1 Residential

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale for Mann Properties.

Present for the Petitioner: Brian Sullivan, Greg Ewing, and Tim Stevens with Mann properties, and Mary Solada with Bingham McHale representing Mann Properties.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Mary Solada** said that they had last presented the case at the Subdivision Committee meeting on June 29, 2006. She said that they had made substantial changes to the plan since then. She said that Greg Ewing would review the changes to the plan. She said that the petitioner had received extremely favorable staff comments in the Department report. She said that the road to the new Central Park had now been paved.

Greg Ewing recapped the prior developments in the project. He said that in June, they came before the petitioners with a proposed density of 10.45 units per acre, or 92 townhomes. He discussed the issues brought up at the June 29, 2006 meeting. He said that the current proposal is 9.9 units per acre. He said that they have increased the setback along Westfield Blvd. significantly. He said that they are now proposing buildings no closer to the Westfield Blvd. right of way line than 20 ft. He said that was over fifty feet of pavement. He said that they had reduced the number of buildings along Westfield Blvd. and that they are now only proposing two buildings along the frontage. He said that they had increased the Westfield Blvd. open space significantly in the Northwest corner of the site. He said that as a result, the new plan saves a lot more trees along the Westfield Blvd. site. He said that all of the trees along the Northern property line are existing. He said that they have increased the number of guest parking spaces. He said that the plan still provides for four and five unit buildings mostly instead of the seven unit buildings that were originally proposed. He said that there were forty to fifty feet apart from one another. He said that there were a few instances of thirty feet between buildings, but that the Aramore project at 99th and Westfield Blvd. had a minimum of fifteen feet of separation between buildings. He said that the townhome component of that project provided almost fifteen feet of separation throughout. He said that there were only a couple of instances of thirty feet of separation between the buildings, which is the minimum in the Townhomes at Central Park project. He said that the building orientation has been structured to prevent garage views from Westfield Blvd. He said that when you look into the site from Westfield Blvd. he believes it would be very difficult to see a garage view. He said that they have resolved all of the preliminary issues and concerns there. He said that they are providing an 80 ft. esplanade through the whole site as well as a fifty-foot esplanade and green space through this portion of the site. He said that since the original filing, the density has been reduced by 26%. He said that ¼ of the density has been reduced and that they feel that is significant. He said that he thinks that they have continued to move in the right direction. He said that they would like to request the Committee's approval today. He said that he would like to request that project be sent to the full Plan Commission and, of course, preferentially with a recommendation for approval.

Rick Ripma called for Public Comments.

Jack Engledow, who resides at 1819 Wood Valley Drive, said that he generally represented the views of the residents of Creekside, Wood Valley, Pine Valley, Jordan Woods and many of the residents along Westfield Blvd. He said that they are not categorically against development. He said that they live in a dynamic community and that they expect change and that they are proud to be a part of Carmel. He said that he thinks that the development needs to follow the

Comprehensive Plan to protect their property rights within reason. He said that a development plan has to have some common sense. He said that they contend that the current proposal fails on all those tests. He said that it is too dense. He said that there are 87 units in the current proposal. He said that it is too tall because he assumes they are still planning to have three-story tall units. He said that it kills too many trees and that it brings too much traffic. He said that it has some potential water problems that have not been discussed with the proximity to Carmel Creek. He said that he feels that the developers have only taken token steps to come to compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Comprehensive Plan identifies this parcel as changing zoning from R-1 to attached residential, formerly multi-family residential. He said that they are curious as to why this parcel is the only area in the township South of 116th Street that is so designated as attached residential that isn't already devoted to multi-family or attached residential. He said that if attached residential is going to be the hand that they are dealt, then he hoped that the developers would play by the rules. He said that the Comprehensive Plan says for this attached residential that it should be two-story or three-story if the context reflects that scale. He said that the only thing in the area that might possibly reflect a three-story is the trees and he said that a lot of those would be leaving if the development were passed. He said that it also talks about a density of seven units per acre. He said that this proposed development is around ten units per acre. He said that he feels that anything going in that area should hit the very low end of the seven units per acre. He said that the proposed development would have to fit into an area where the density was around one unit per acre, if not a little less than that. He said that he thinks that the recent approval of the Gramercy proposal along Keystone and 126th Street have added to a rising concern that anything goes in zoning. He said that a three-story development would open speculation of developers with regards to where they could build townhomes next. He said that, in general, they think that because of the way that it fits into the Comprehensive Plan, it should be rejected out of hand because it is a bad development. He said that, perhaps, the zoning designation permitting attached residential is not an appropriate classification. He said that he thinks that Mann Development is a highly respected firm and that they have done a good job in other locations. He said that he would urge the Committee to not pass this plan as proposed.

Carol Ludwig, who resides at 10725 Westfield Blvd., which she noted is downstream from the said development, said that this was her first time looking at the development and that her comments would be a little raw because she wasn't prepared to comment on it. She said that she sees this parcel as a developers delight. She said that the City Parks and Recreation Department is paying for the development of green space for them. She said that time and time again, she has seen the City of Carmel letting developers piggyback on all the funding that is used by the City itself. She said that the developers use Carmel and feed off of it. She said that she sees this project as presenting a huge traffic problem that the City will have to address. She said that it is a developers dream. She said that she wanted to know which unit the people who are developing it were going to live in. She said that most of the time, living South of the said property, she can't get out of her driveway and that the developers were proposing to add eighty-seven more families to the area. She said that she didn't know how she would get out of her driveway without getting rear-ended as she has been in the past. She said that the site presented an environmental challenge. She said that the development was going to impact her. She said that she doesn't see a lot of green space, other than Central Park. She said that she didn't see where

guests would park and that she felt that the project needed to go back to the drawing board.

Rick Ripma closed the public hearing and called for the petitioner's rebuttal.

Mary Solada said that this project is completely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. She said that the Comprehensive Plan suggests this because, as the Department Report points out, there is a correlation between density and City Services. She said that there was a major regional City Park that was going to be generating a lot of traffic. She said that within walking distance there was a neighborhood commercial development. She said that the notion is that the City Services are there and that the density should be reserved for the core and that the area in question is closer to the core than a lot of other areas towards the East and the West. She said that 16,000 vehicles travel by the site per day. She said that the proposed development would be about 200 cars. She said that they believe that they are literally a drop in the bucket compared to the traffic Central Park will generate. She said that the bottom line about the height is that you pick your poison. She said that if they were to do some type of single-family detached development, site coverage would be increased and the petitioners would not be able to save as many trees and may not be able to do the grand promenade and the other things that make the proposed development unique. She said that they are talking about average pricing of \$250,000-\$300,000. She said that she would guess that is within 25% of the price of many of the homes in the area. She said that the other thing that is worth noting is that when the petitioners were approached by neighbors after the other two meetings, she said that it was clear that they don't want townhomes. She said that the petitioners feel that townhomes is what the Comprehensive Plan is calling for. She said that discussion about single-family homes, etc. wasn't going to be a meaningful dialogue for either party. She noted that the Department Report calls the development one of the best-designed townhome developments on record in Carmel. She said that they would ask the Committee for their indulgence and that after all of the discussion over the last few months, she believes that the petitioners are ready for a vote.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that she would like to read some excerpts from the Department Report. She said that with Carmel's Urban Design Initiative, the increased density within the city has been directed to the City's core. She said that it is the Department and the City's goal to accommodate growth in the most responsible manner. She said that they see this as doing so. She said that the City Engineer feels that this development will not be of concern with regards to increased traffic, when it is considered in the whole scheme of things. She said that the developer has made it a priority to preserve many of the mature trees on the site. She said that in terms of site design and architecture, the Department feels that it is one of the better townhome projects in Carmel. She said that all of the Urban Forestry issues have been resolved and the Department recommends that the Committee vote on this tonight and send it to the full Plan Commission.

Carol Schleif said that they asked for a lot of things last time. She said that the best that she could tell, one four-plex has been removed and two trees were saved. She said that at the last meeting there were issues about density and it is still way off in her opinion. She said that the Committee asked for some two-story. She said that she personally thinks that some one- and two-story would be more in fitting with the neighborhood. She said that five townhomes in a

row makes a huge building and she said that was really out of place for that neighborhood. She said that they have to address transition issues. She said that there is already an existing transition from commercial back to single-family residential at the house to the North of the property and she said that putting this development in would take it back to high-density, multi-family housing. She said that if the petitioners had the property to the North, it would be a different issue. She said that she thinks that it needs to be in keeping with what is already there. She said that when she is laying out developments, she uses the height of the two buildings to determine the building separation. She said that based on that assessment, the building separation is not enough. She said that she can see how this project can work, she said that she was just hoping to see a little more of what the Committee asked for at the last meeting.

Kevin Heber said that, with all due respect to the one single-family home there, he doesn't see one home as being significant enough to be a transition. He said that the proposed development is pretty close to the core. He said that in his mind it isn't "the core." He said that the challenges of what is going to work in the area and preserving the character of the area should warrant the petitioners showing a view from Rangeline. He said that having that picture would help him tremendously to be able to visualize. He said that at the very least he would also like to see tree preservation and, even better, would be a tree ID and preservation plan overlaid, so that they could see exactly which trees would be coming down. He said that he thinks that the important issue with this project is the character and he said that he believes that is largely determined by what can be seen from Rangeline. He said that if it can be determined that the feel of driving down Rangeline will not change, then at least they can say that has been addressed. He said that he doesn't really have a major issue with the proposal other than that he wants to make sure that the character remains in tact. He said that he doesn't really have a vision for what else could possibly work here. He said that Dan Dutcher would probably mention something that he might think would work better than what has been proposed. Kevin Heber said that he doesn't really see that idea working better than what has been proposed.

Dan Dutcher said that he thinks that height, density, and scale all remain an issue to him. He said that he thinks that this is a significant improvement over what they saw before. He said that he thinks that three stories may not be appropriate for this area. He said that the project is still dense. He said that he doesn't accept the idea that somehow, because there is a park entrance off of Rangeline Road, that becomes the line of demarcation of where they will apply the New Urban approach. He said that there would be three entrances to Central Park. He said that the anticipated "main entrances" would be along 111th street and College Avenue. He said that this is one area where he probably differs from the Department in terms of the designation of this property for high-intense urban use. He said that he thinks that we can fall into a habit of thinking that townhomes are the only vehicle by which we can achieve desired urban, higher-intensity kind of uses. He said that if you look at the Comprehensive Plan draft, there is a heading called "Urban Residential". He said that it permits density up to 6.9 units per acre. He said that it has a much more residential feel to it and he thinks that would be a better fit for this location. He said that the petitioners would have increased density, but the character and residential flavor would be retained. He said that he thinks that his major issue is that using townhomes on the property as proposed doesn't accomplish what he feels should be accomplished from a transition standpoint.

Kevin Heber said that he personally would rather see the green space preserved that the townhome proposal would allow. He said that he could see both sides, but that it would feel more open despite the increased height because the townhomes allowed the petitioner to retain so much open space.

Dan Dutcher said that he assumes that reducing the density would generate more open space. He said that the “Urban Residential” would generate around 6 units per acre as opposed to the 10 units per acre proposed in the townhome development.

Carol Schleif pointed out that the green space in the middle was a utility easement, so there would not be any building on that easement.

Rick Ripma asked the petitioners if they were willing to change the plan enough to make it worth the Committee’s time to come back and look at it again or if the Committee should just vote on it.

Tim Stephens responded that the petitioners would like the Committee to vote on it tonight.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to send docket number **06040017 PUD: Townhomes at Central Park** back to the full Plan Commission with a **negative recommendation**.

Carol Schleif seconded the motion.

Motion **PASSED** unanimously (4-0).

...END...

3. Docket No. 06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford

The applicant seeks approval for a proposed building alteration.

The site is located at 10650 North Michigan Road and is zoned B3/Business. The site is located partially within the US 421/Michigan Road Overlay District.

Filed by John Pearson of Pearson Realty, LLC, for Pearson Ford.

Present for the Petitioner: Dave Coots with Coots, Henke, & Wheeler.

Petitioner’s Presentation: **Dave Coots** said that at the last Committee meeting, the petitioners had asked for the approval of the signs, as well as the Committee’s approval to substitute the Deco-Brick material or a clay-brick veneer for the Collision center that has been approved. He noted that they had presented several examples of buildings in which the building material had been used. He discussed the different finishes that could be applied to the product and how it would be applied. He said that the Deco-Brick is a concrete-based product and the dye is mixed in the mortar and permeates the entire unit. He said that they would ask that the Committee approve their request to modify the building material.

Carol Schleif clarified that the Deco-Brick material was a full-mortared material.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that the Department recommended that the item be approved once all concerns were addressed. She said that the item would only require Committee approval.

Rick Ripma said that he appreciated the petitioners' information because he really didn't know what the material was or whether it would be acceptable. He said that he now understands what it is and he is fine with it.

Carol Schleif clarified that the petitioner would save a considerable amount of money by using this building material. She asked if the petitioners could consider putting some skylights in the addition to the truck service center.

Dave Coots said that this material would be going on the new structure that was going to be the collision center and that it wouldn't be going on the addition to the truck service center.

Carol Schleif clarified that she was requesting them on the new building because it had office areas and mechanics areas deep in the building that could use the natural sunlight.

Dave Coots said that he would certainly present the idea to Mr. Pearson and to the Architect involved on the project. He said that addition wouldn't change the exterior.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to **APPROVE** docket number **06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford**.

The motion was seconded.

Motion was **approved (4-0)**.

...END...

4. Docket No. 06060016 Z: Cherry Tree Grove Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 20.44 acres from S1 to S2 to allow for low-density residential development. Commitments will be filed in conjunction with this request. The site is located on the east side of Cherry Tree Road, south of 146th Street. Filed by Matthew Skelton of Baker & Daniels, LLP.

Present for the Petitioner: Matt Skelton with Baker & Daniels, LLP and Chris White with RDJ Development, LLC.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Matt Skelton** said that the Staff was asked to provide an explanation of conservancy lot and he said that he thought that was included with the

Department Report. He said that another item that was raised was the shape of the proposed retention pond. He said that they have actually incorporated those comments into the design. He said that they have tried to give the proposed retention pond a more organic form. He said that they were asked to provide a probable layout for lot 34, which is the conservancy lot. He said that was included with the Committee packet materials. He said that they were asked to provide an aerial exhibit, which was also included in the packet of materials. He said that the Staff was asked to do an analysis of the City's draft Architectural guidelines versus what was being proposed. He said that they did a quick analysis and included that in the packet of materials. He said that he thinks they have provided everything that the Plan Commission asked for.

Rick Ripma called for Public Comments.

Barry Smalstig, who resides at 14320 Cherry Tree Road, said that his property forms the South and a portion of the West boundary of the proposed subdivision. He said that he did send the Plan Commission a letter. He said that they generally support the project, but that their major concern is traffic. He said that Cherry Tree Road is a small, twisty road with about twenty-0three homes on it. He said that they are not thrilled with the thought that a property that currently has two homes on it will have thirty-something homes on it. He said that they think that they can live with that. He said that the one thing that they really object to is the connection to the proposed Legacy/Earlham property. He said that he understands that the Plan Commission likes to have interconnectivity, but he said that opening several thousand home sites to the East side of the property to access Cherry Tree Road makes no sense. He said that if it were a path that allowed bike traffic or pedestrian traffic, then it would make sense to have connectivity there. He said that opening it up to the large Legacy project makes no sense. He said that other than that, they support the project.

Dottie Brisley, who resides at 14558 Cherry Tree Road, said that she wanted to show the Committee some pictures of the property that will be developed. She said that he property is the largest one that abuts the proposed development. She said that they were in favor of the project. She said that they were hoping that they could move forward with the project, so the earthwork could be done in the winter to cut down on a lot of the dust. She said that she was showing the pictures because the petitioners have said that a lot of the trees along the Northern part will remain and she wanted the Committee to see how pretty it was. She said that they were really pleased with the development as they proposed it. She said that he only concern is that they move it through, so the petitioners can start on it as quickly as possible, so it doesn't get into next summer.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that the Staff has no outstanding concerns with the rezone given the proposed commitments. She said that the proposed primary plat does not need any additional waivers as proposed. She said that the Department recommends that the Committee forward this to the full Plan Commission with a positive recommendation.

Dan Dutcher clarified that the Committee would only be moving on the rezone request at this point and that the stub request was not at issue at this point. He clarified that the Department was comfortable with the Architectural Standards proposed, even though they do not fully live

up to the Draft Architectural guidelines.

Angie Conn said that seemed to be the case.

Carol Schleif said that she would have to stand firm on the Draft Architectural guidelines because having windows on the sides of the homes is really important for light and air in the home. She said that she would really like to see that happen at this point and have that stated in the commitments. She said that the garages wouldn't have to be front loading. She said that courtyard garages could be utilized. She asked the petitioners for further explanation on the four-foot front porches.

Matt Skelton said that they have tried to hold to as many of the Draft Architectural guidelines as make sense with the petitioners existing custom product. He said that because of the design of some of their models, not every one of them would necessarily work. He said that some of the commitments that they are making are above what the Draft Architectural standards call for to mitigate for the ones that the petitioner was not meeting, such as roof pitch and building materials.

Carol Schleif said that she thinks that the homes the petitioner builds should meet all of the Draft Architectural standards. She said that part of what she thinks Carmel is looking for Carmel is to raise the bar of the design. She said that it isn't a poor investment, but that it is helping them find the criteria that they are looking for.

Rick Ripma clarified what Chimney panels are.

Christine Barton-Holmes explained that the panels are usually an EIFS drivet or hearty plank material. She said that the intent of the inclusion of that in the Draft Architectural standards is to prohibit the use of Vinyl Siding materials on the chimneys.

Rick Ripma clarified that the panel would look like masonry or stucco material.

Carol Schleif said that the petitioners should strike the language that says "as architecturally appropriate" from the window section and the roofline section. She said that the petitioners could say EIFS instead of panels.

Kevin Heber said that he thought that no one would even use a four-foot porch.

Rick Ripma said that since the homes are courtyard, he assumes the houses are pushed forward.

Matt Skelton said that they could do the six-foot porch. He said that the architectural language is right out of the standards.

Dan Dutcher asked if the window standard could be changed as well.

Matt Skelton said that poses a problem depending on how the interiors are laid out. He said that certain furniture doesn't work in the rooms depending on window placement.

Carol Schleif said that she couldn't disagree with that more. She said that she knew the petitioners could do it.

Matt Skelton said that wasn't an issue that they could answer this evening without checking with RDJ's architect.

Dan Dutcher suggested that the Committee move on the rezone tonight and discuss the architectural standards later

Matt Skelton said that they could be redesigned to be effective upon plat instead of rezone. He said that the issue is that the petitioners wanted to pin down as many things as they possibly could, so the platting process is expedited. He said that they could include it in the commitments that they would review the architectural standards at the plat process.

Discussion ensued whether they were actually going to be custom homes or not.

Carol Schleif said that the day lighting issue is becoming a public health issue. She said that saving a few dollars now could turn into costing the health care system a whole lot of money. She said that we have the science and numbers now to back that up. She said that she would just like to see the petitioners go with the guidelines.

Matt Skelton said that it had little to do with saving money, but rather, it was about floor plans.

Carol Schleif said that skylights could be an effective alternative.

Rick Ripma asked if the windows requirement was for the exterior look of the home.

Christine Barton-Holmes said that it was for the look, but that it was also a public health and safety issue. She said that when there are windows on all four sides of the home, there could be good cross ventilation that would alleviate a lot of the problems that newer houses tend to have with mold and stagnant air, etc. She said that it allows for more daylight in the rooms, which uses less electricity.

Matt Skelton said that after discussing it with his client, they would just agree to the standards as proposed, if that were acceptable to the Committee. He said that the petitioners would retract what has already been submitted and that they would go with the City of Carmel's draft Architectural standards.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to send docket number **06060016 Z: Cherry Tree Grove Rezone** back to the full Plan Commission with a **favorable recommendation with the inclusion of the modification by the petitioner to use the City's Draft Architectural Standards.**

The motion was seconded.

Motion was unanimously **approved. (4-0)**

...END...

5. Docket No. 06010005 Z: Shelborne Property PUD – CONT TO OCT. 3

The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of developing single-family residences.

The site is located on the west side of Shelborne Road, north of 121st Street.

Filed by Charles Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development Co.

6. Docket No. 06010009 Z: Crook PUD – CONT. TO OCT. 3

The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD for the purpose of platting 40 single family homes on 20 acres.

The site is located at 2238 W. 136th Street and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Charlie Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development.

**7. Docket No. 06020017 CPA: 96th & Westfield Neighborhood Plan
CONT. TO OCT. 3**

The applicant seeks to amend the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan in order to incorporate the 96th & Westfield Neighborhood Plan.

Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

8. Docket No. 06050020 PP: Clay Creek – CONT TO. OCT. 3

The applicant seeks to plat 30 lots on 29.971 acres.

The site is located on Hoover Road north of 116th Street and is zoned S1.

The applicant seeks the following waivers for the proposed plat:

06050022 SW: SCO Chapter 6.05.07 Orientation of Home – request to allow dwellings to face internal street

06050023 SW: SCO Chapter 7.05.07 Clearing of greater than 15% of mature woodlands.

Filed by Charlie Frankenberger for MHE Development Co. LLC.

September 5, 2006
Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

Subdivision Committee Chair – Rick Ripma

Respectfully Submitted By: Laura Rouse-DeVore